

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/075,970	02/14/2002	Michael Helmus	01-202	9278	
27774 759	90 10/06/2006		EXAMINER		
MAYER & WILLIAMS PC			HO, UYEN T		
251 NORTH AV 2ND FLOOR	VENUE WEST		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WESTFIELD, 1	NJ 07090		3731		
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/200	DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u> </u>		
	10/075,970	HELMUS, MICHAEL	-		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho	3731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowa	action is non-final.	osecution as to the r	nerits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9-21 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9-21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers			•		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National S	itage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/075,970

Art Unit: 3731

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/06 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Applicant argues that cited reference, Steinke does not disclose the concept of the present claims which is the control of changes in rigidity of a medical device, e.g., a stent, so that the device becomes decreasingly rigid and increasingly biomechanically compatible with body tissues in contract with the device over a period of time. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The concept or intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use or the concept of the present claims, then it meets the claim.

Steinke disclose the stent being made from polymer or metal or ceramic or combination thereof (col. 14-18), lines 8 and 17, col. 17, Steinke discloses the biodegradable materials for making the stent being calcium phosphate glass or BIOGLASS, magnesium alloys; line 28, col. 17, Steinke discloses hydroxyapatitie for making the stent; Steinke also discloses a biodegradable outer layer or coating as claimed (col. 17, lines 30-37). Since the materials as disclosed by Steinke for making a stent are the same with the materials of the claimed invention (as disclose in paragraph 39 and 42 of the specification of the instant application), the stent as disclosed by Steinke adapted to perform the same function as the stent as claimed.

With a broadest reasonable interpretation, the outer coating controls the initial rate at which the inner core material becomes flexible upon contact with body fluids.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Steinke et al. (6,623,521). Steinke et al. disclose an implantable stent comprising a biodegradable inner core and a biodegradable covering materials as claimed (col. 14-18) and the stent having including one or more drug coating (col. 19-22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinke et al. (6,623,521). Steinke et al. disclose all the limitation of the claims except

fail to suggest a stent having a monofilament, a multifilament or braided filament configuration as claimed. It is well known in the art to make a stent from monofilament wound into helical form or multifilament braided together. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the stent configuration of Steinke et al. with the well known configurations as claimed. Doing so would amount to mere substitution of one configuration with another configuration within the same art that would support a vessel lumen as well as the configuration of Steinke et al.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho whose telephone number is 571-272-4696. The examiner can normally be reached on MULTIFLEX Mon. to Sat..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANHTUAN NGUYEN can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3731

September 30, 2006